

REMARKS

1. Claims 62 and 69 have been amended as suggested by the Examiner (OA §3), thereby correcting the informalities.

2. The limitation in 62 which prompted the written description (WD) rejection has been deleted. We assume this has no impact on the Examiner's comment in OA §8 concerning claim 71 (see point 3 below).

The WD rejection of 72-73 is mooted by the cancellation of those claims.

3. In OA §8, the Examiner conceded that claim 71 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all limitations of its base claim(s) (62). Claim 62 has been amended to include the limitation of 71, and hence should be allowable, even though the "problem" limitation was excised. Claim 71 has been cancelled as it was made redundant by the amendment to 62. Previously independent claim 69 has been made dependent on 62, so all claims are now directly or indirectly dependent on amended 62.

4. An issue fee of \$685 was paid on November 29, 2000. According to the February 10, 2005 decision on petition, the previously made payment can be applied against the new issue fee if this case is allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By: 

Iver P. Cooper
Reg. No. 28,005

624 Ninth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20001
Telephone: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile: (202) 737-3528
IPC:lms
G:\ipc\g-i\HEAM\KOENIG2\pto amend aftfn1.wpd